DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 390 137 EA 027 242

AUTHOR Hill, Flo H.; And Others
TITLE Establishing a Collaborative Climate: Perceptions of a First Year Principal and Faculty.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Collegiality; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Environment; Elementary Education; Interprofessional Relationship; *Organizational Climate; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This paper presents findings of a study that examined the perceptions of a first-year principal and faculty as they responded to implementation efforts to develop a collaborative climate in their rural Louisiana elementary school. Data were obtained from interviews with the principal and 31 teachers, a principal survey and a teacher survey, and analysis of school action plans and teacher journals. The data show that perceptions of the faculty and principal varied, although both parties agreed that establishing a collaborative climate was necessary and entailed more than a cooperative enterprise. Obstacles to altering role perceptions included entrenched perceptions of traditional roles, the isolated structure of teacher work that traded rewards for compliance, and a bureaucratic district-school relationship. Strategies to encourage collaboration and collegiality include common preparation time and release time for peer observation, group decision making, staff development, and action research. Collegiality is not a result of an organizational arrangement; it comes from true commitment to duties, to the school, and to each other. Appendices contain sample interview questions, leadership-development activities and worksheets, and a copy of the principal questionnaire. (Contains 11 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 390 137

ESTABLISHING A COLLABORATIVE CLIMATE: PERCEPTIONS OF A FIRST YEAR PRINCIPAL AND FACULTY

Flo H. Hill, Livingston Parish Public Schools
Glenda Lofton, Southeastern Louisiana University
Sheila Chauvin, Southeastern Louisiana University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

F. Hill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, CA
April, 1995

EA027242

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Establishing a Collaborative Climate: Perceptions of a First Year Principal and Faculty

Introduction

School districts across the nation are addressing reform by means of school restructuring. Strategies gaining much attention are inclusive of effective schools, shared decision making, quality management and professionalization of teaching. Through these reform efforts, vision, problem solving, value consensus, teacher collaboration, collegiality and professionalism have emerged as major constructs (Crow, 1994).

In this more recent body of literature, collaboration and collegiality are appearing with increased frequency from which a new framework for school community has emerged (Sergiovanni, 1993; Bryk, Lee and Holland, 1993; Little, 1992; Bryk and Driscoll, 1988; Noddings, 1988; Coleman and Hoffer, 1987).

Reform efforts focusing on teacher professionalism emphasize the importance and development of "community" in the school. There is a focus on collaboration and collegiality. Teacher professionalism strategies in relation to collaboration and collegiality have had a major impact on role perceptions of the principal and the teacher.

The principal's role has shifted to one of facilitator of decision making in an effort to support the development of "community". No longer are school administrator's expected to be merely managers of routines, but must prepare to take initiative. In collaborative school climates, the principal must understand

change as well as manage it. Openness to diversity, conflict, reflection and mistakes becomes a necessity. In the facilitative role of fostering collaboration and collegiality, the principal must motivate staff to be dynamically interactive, professionally effective and mission oriented. Thus, knowledge of professional and organizational development and strong interpersonal and communication skills are critical components.

New ways of viewing the administrative role have implications for the teacher's role. The term facilitator implies that there are participants other than the principal. The teacher's role becomes one of active involvement and not one of passive recipient of rules and regulations. Active participation in decision making, conflict resolution, problem solving and reflective practice is characteristic of the new role. For example, teachers may assume the responsibility of peer intervention and assistance by setting standards for their own performance. They may engage in reflective practice through sharing of their own and others' beliefs and experiences surrounding certain issues and topics related to their own professional growth.

In response to two legislative mandates, the Louisiana Teaching Internship Law (1984) and the Children First Act (1988), the state of Louisiana began moving toward the development of an on-the-job assessment/evaluation procedure for classroom teachers targeting certification, professional development and induction decisions. During 1990-91, after several years of research and development, the state of Louisiana began implementation of a

comprehensive, one-the-job assessment process requiring all beginning and experienced teachers to meet requirements of these legislative acts. Approximately 8000 experienced teachers and 200 beginning teachers were assessed with the STAR (System for Teaching and learning Assessment Review) (Ellett, Loup, Chauvin, 1990). The Louisiana STAR model represents what was considered a newer generation of classroom assessment processes that focuses more holistically on both effective classroom teaching and learning within a context of multiple classroom-based assessments. The uniqueness of the STAR model lies in its broadening of the assessment focus to include collaborative staff development and professional improvement.

At the heart of the assessment system is the belief that a teacher assessment system should be part of an ongoing improvement process at the school and classroom level in which teachers reflect on their own understandings and work collaboratively with their principal, colleagues and students to enhance teaching and learning. With newer calls for the incorporation of shared decision making, extended staff development and collaborative leadership models into practitioners' professional relations (Lieberman, 1986), a collaborative reflective professional growth model was designed. To supplement this model, a number of staff development resources were developed including modules on conducting professional development conferences in a collaborative manner, a professional development Ideabook for designing in-building, classroom-based, learner-focused professional growth

activities, a three part series on reflective practice and a module on developing students' thinking skills.

Purpose

As an outgrowth to the much larger project previously reviewed, this paper focuses on a qualitative year-long examination, in addition to quantitative measures, of a first year principal's perceptions along with faculty attitude and behavior in an attempt to respond to an immersion of shared reflective practice as the means of establishing a collaborative climate within the local school setting.

The purpose of this paper is to report a chronology of events, related issues and concerns observed and documented in the year long effort designed to examine the development of a collaborative climate. Specifically, the case study addressed the following questions:

1. What teacher attitudes and behaviors are present regarding a first year administrator? (Interview)
2. How do these perceptions impact the development of a collaborative climate? (Action Plan)
3. What are the perceptions of a first year administrator regarding teacher attitude and expected behavior? (TAI)
4. What shared perspectives exist among the administrator and faculty? (TAI)

Methods and Procedures

Sample

This case study involved one rural elementary (kindergarten through grade 4) school. All thirty-one (31) teachers were asked to participate as well as one administrator. The faculty was familiar with the STAR Model and had participated in the state mandated process the prior year under another administration. The beginning administrator had successfully completed training in all aspects of the assessment process and staff development modules.

Instrumentation

Both qualitative and quantitative data were collected. Qualitative data included semi-structured interviews (Appendix A) and self-report data inclusive of journals and action plans (Appendix B).

Quantitative data consisted of the principal's and teacher perceptions/attitudes of the principal's leadership measured by the 72 item Teacher Attitude Inventory (TAI) (Appendix C) (Licata, 1989). The instrument asks teachers to assess their principal's leadership in the following areas: administrative practices, management of materials and equipment, staff relations, educational effectiveness, management of buildings and facilities, time management, school vision, and school robustness. The response format for item numbers 1-63 and 84-110 is a five point Likert scale ranging from A="Strongly Disagree, C="Neutral" , to E="Strongly Agree." Item numbers 64-83 consist of adjective pairs used to describe two key concepts of the school work environment

and a five point scoring scale for each adjective pair.

Data Collection

Qualitative data were collected by members of a university research staff during the school year including the summer months. A semi-structured instrument was used to collect interview data at the beginning of the school year to gain insights into teacher perceptions and expectations of the new administration. Self report data inclusive of journals containing written entries, observation notes and action plans were also collected.

Quantitative data included individual instruments packaged for each teacher and distributed. Detailed directions for completing and returning the survey were enclosed. Teachers completed the packets and returned them to a central location for pick-up. Quantitative data was collected in the spring semester of the school year. A total of 29 useable surveys (90.3%) were returned along with the principal's self assessment.

Data Analyses

Typed protocols of teacher interview data were examined line-by-line and commonalities were identified and reported. Administrator and faculty responses, perceptions and beliefs were analyzed and reported in relation to the following key events: semi-structured interviews, teacher/administrator conferences, needs assessment, staff development activities, action plans and small group meetings.

Descriptive statistical summaries were computed for the Teacher Attitude Inventory (TAI). Comparisons were made between

principal and teacher perceptions. Differences were computed and analyzed. A school profile (Appendix D) was generated from the data collected inclusive of an item summary and total summary for each category on the survey. The principal predicted score, teacher actual score and difference index were computed for each item on the survey. From these data, ten (10) highest and ten (10) lowest mean scores were identified and ranked accordingly.

Results

Interview Data

To study how teachers perceived the new administrator, expected changes and how these would impact the school, a group of teachers from each grade level was interviewed before the beginning of the school year. The data revealed a desire from teachers for change to take place in the school environment. For example, when asked the question "what do you expect from the new administrator?", the teacher replied with:

> I expect change. We need innovative change and "fresh blood" will make a difference. I expect the kids will come first.

Other comments relative to change were inclusive of:

> We need to change the lack of interaction among teachers across grade levels. Teachers need to be more actively involved in the whole of the school.
>
> We need to work more together, not as individuals. You don't need to feel like an outsider.
>
> You know - there is just not a lot of interaction with other grade levels and it needs to be. We need to move toward more school wide planning.
>
> I expect changes in what is expected of us as teachers, evaluation and observations. We need help in understanding what is expected and how it can be achieved in the classroom.

> Hopefully the principal can play a helpful role in providing us with alternatives.

The greatest concern for teachers was the administrator's familiarity with the state mandated STAR assessment process and how this would impact their responsibilities and the changes that might be expected of them. At each grade level K-grade 4, when asked about the greatest concern with the new administrator, replies included "assessment and professional development." The following are the exact words of teachers.

> How often will the principal be in the classroom? We're concerned about the STAR. We need help.
>
> How many evaluations will there be?
>
> The state assessment process will be relied upon heavily.
>
> We may not live up to the principal's expectations. I expect the new administrator to be demanding in terms of my responsibilities and teaching performance.
>
> Basically it is the fear of the unknown - change. And I wonder about flexibility and how we can all grow together as professionals.

When asked about the school as it existed and what was considered to be the greatest need, teachers repeatedly asked for support in needed resources and staff development. Responses at each grade level made reference to these needs.

> Our greatest need is maps, science supplies and equipment and the opportunity to use them.
>
> We need up-to-date information on attention deficit disorder and how to deal with these students in the classroom. You know we're seeing more and more of these each year. We need new programs.
>
> Inservices in new techniques and ideas would be useful especially in math with so much emphasis being placed on thinking skills and problem solving.

> Materials to implement more hands on activities and ideas in grouping of students in the classroom to accommodate individual differences
>
> We need summer workshops and grade level communication. Communication is needed all the way around. Parents, for some reason, are afraid to communicate with teachers. Teachers are afraid to communicate across grade levels. Maybe afternoon informal sessions would help.

Self Report Data

Reflective journal entries indicating the establishment of a collaborative climate included the following:

> The principal really encourages staff development and allows teachers to participate in training to improve skills.
>
> There seems to be a school wide focus on instructional improvement with ideas discussed periodically.
>
> We're made aware of expectations and goals to incorporate in strategies for success.
>
> A grade level meeting was attended today. We meet on a weekly basis. The grade level chair reported on discussions across grade levels and the need for scope and sequence in some of the content areas. We will begin looking at the Louisiana unit that is taught in every grade. It seems as though we're all teaching the same thing.
>
> We have an opportunity to express ideas, strategies and concerns we encounter through weekly and monthly meetings.
>
> We meet too often. Time is a big factor. There is just not enough time in the week to do everything that is expected.

During faculty meetings and small group meetings problems were brainstormed and problem solving strategies employed to correct the need. Comments in these meetings were reflective of organizational issues that dealt with school rules and procedures. The issues did not focus at all on what had been original concerns in the teacher interviews. Problems brainstormed included the following:

> no tissue in the restroom
> stall doors missing in the restroom

lawn mower noise at 2:00
lunchroom noise
lunchroom behavior
running on the sidewalk
noisy parents outside classrooms
parents coming straight to rooms
gates being left unlocked after school hours
drop off spot too corwded
students arriving too early on campus
a bossy parent in the workroom
too much paperwork
teachers not being informed of bus and lunch changes
lack of communication from the office to teachers

These problems were later grouped into four main issues which were identified as 1)janitorial, 2) discipline, 3) parents, and 4) miscellaneous.

Performance goals and objectives written in the form of action plans included goals such as 1) to foster and facilitate collaboration and collegiality, 2) to promote meaningful professional growth/learning, and 3) to define and solve school problems collaboratively. Activities documented throughout the year were reflective of original goals. The following were noted:

The principal appointed and worked with an action research committee to discuss recommendations and develop strategies in solving school problems.

The teachers were provided with opportunities to share ideas and techniques through classroom visitation.

Teachers were inserviced on their role in an effective conference.

Strategies were explored to make ongoing professional development part of the normative life of the school.

University students were invited to participate in the school instructional program providing teachers with the opportunity to observe peers and pre-service teachers.

The principal organized and attended regularly scheduled action research committee meetings to introduce and initiate consequence analysis proceedings.

A management plan was developed, implemented and evaluated through consequence analysis.

Survey Data

On the TAI in category A, Administrative Practices, the principal's predicted score was 34 (75.56% of the maximum) compared to the teachers' actual score of 28.62 (63.60% of the maximum). This total summary shows the principal's predicted score as high and the teacher actual score in the middle level. The teacher mean score was greatest (3.96 on a five point scale) on item number 6 (My principal shows initiative in seeking ways to help us in our work) and the least (3.11) on item number 1 (My principal backs me up in my dealings with parents).

In category B (Materials/Equipment) both the administrator and teacher score fell in the low level indicating the difference between perceptions to be extremely small. The principal's predicted score was 12 (48% of the maximum) and teacher actual score was 12.48 (49.93% of the maximum) out of a total possible of 25 points. Item number 14 (I have sufficient supplies for my work) showed the smallest difference index of .63.

Student/Teacher Relationships scores for both the principal predicted and teacher actual score was at the middle level. The principal and teacher scores noted item number 20 (I like the work assignment (grade level or subject matter) that I now have) with the highest score. The principal rated this item with a 5 and the teacher actual mean score was 4.19. Item number 19 (Teachers

and other professional personnel in this school freely share ideas and materials was given a score of 4 by the principal and 3.30 by teachers.

Category D, Educational Effectiveness indicated scores of mid levels by the principal and teachers. Teachers and principal rated item number 27 (In my opinion, adequate educational standards are being upheld in this school) with the greatest score and item number 23 (People in the community this school serves are educated oriented) with the smallest score.

The difference in the principal's predicted score and teachers' actual mean score was greatest in the category of Building Facilities where the principal's predicted score was 14.00 (70% of the maximum) and the teachers' actual mean score was 9.31 (46.55% of the maximum). Item number 29 (Adequate facilities are available for my use during off-periods for grading papers, meeting with students and parents and the like) revealed the greatest index difference of 2.11. The principal's score for this item was 4 and the teacher actual score was 1.89. The fact that teachers had no regularly scheduled "off-period" may have contributed to the low score.

In the Time Management category , the difference index between the principal predicted score and the teacher actual score was the least overall. However, item number 36 (This school is well organized and there is plenty of time available for instruction) showed a large difference in principal and teacher perceptions. The principal predicted score was 2 and the teacher actual score

was 3.52 indicating a difference index of -1.52.

Category G (Vision) contains the largest number of items. Both the principal and teacher scored overall in the mid level with a principal's score of 55 (73.33% of the maximum) and a teacher actual score of 42.10 (56.14% of the maximum). The difference indexes ranged from a high of 1.12 for item number 46 (Teachers are regularly encouraged by the principal to make sacrifices to accomplish what this school ought to be) to a low of 0 for item number 48 (I make personal sacrifices to accomplish the vision of what this school ought to be). The principal's score for item number 46 was 4 and the teacher actual score was 2.88. In item number 48 both principal and teachers perceived sacrifices as being made by scoring this item with a 4.

The highest mean scores range from a high of 4.25 for item number 17 which states "There are many cliques or groups in this school, but the atmosphere is still friendly" to a low of 3.77 for item number 4 (I get help I need in handling difficult discipline cases). The ten lowest mean scores range from 1.89 for facility item number 29 (Adequate facilities are available...) to 3.00 for item number 11 (Students in this school have all needed supplementary materials).

Predicted scores and actual scores on the Robustness Semantic Differential (adjective paris) were most similar for "My principal is..." and least similar for "My school is..." The principal's predicted score was highest for "My principal is..." and the teacher actual score was highest for "My school is..."

Discussion/Conclusions/Implications

The results of this case study combine quantitative data with qualitative data which shed light on the establishment of a collaborative climate within the school setting. By combining interview and self report data with survey data a more complex description of establishing a collaborative environment is possible. Interview responses, journal entries and action plans, along with survey data, contributed to confirming a need for collaborative change and willingness on the part of the faculty and administration to engage in such an effort. However, the data presents considerable evidence that perceptions vary between administrator and faculty although both agree that establishing a collaborative climate is a necessity and seemingly is more than a cooperative enterprise.

Perhaps by altering role perceptions to emphasize the importance and development of "community", a change will be made in the way schools are viewed. As Sergiovanni suggests, changing the metaphor from "organization" to "community" changes the theory. A community is a collective "we" with shared values, commitments and professional norms. With this shift in thought as with any change, it is the obstacles identified through the use of data that must be overcome if efforts emphasizing community through the use of collaboration and collegiality are to prove successful.

An existing teacher-principal relationship based on traditional role perceptions is one factor that must be addressed. The bureaucratic hierarchy of school as an organization has

contributed to the distinction between teacher and principal. Historically teachers and principals have separated themselves. Each group has its own professional organization, preparation program and job description. There has been a distinction made between the two roles.

Relations between the principal and teacher are impacted by power distribution, conflict resolution, decision making, codes of conduct and boundaries/turf, to name a few. For example, the principal uses the power of the position to influence thoughts and actions of others. He tells subordinates how to practice and mandates compliance with organizational goals that he has determined. Decision making regarding policy is often perceived by teachers as a means of domination or as a way of imposing an individualized belief system. In other words, the principal uses control to support administrative values. Using rules and regulations, monitoring and supervising teachers contributes to the perception that principals are in control.

On the average, teachers seldom view the principal as expert in the teaching and learning process. The principal is seen has having little to no understanding of what is happening in the classroom. The exercise of power is again utilized by someone no longer in the classroom. This discredits the principal as a professional.

On the other hand, principals often perceive teachers as having no understanding of the system as a whole. For example, what may be a minor incident to the principal is thought to be a

major catastrophe to the teacher. How the principal reacts to these incidents in relation to those that have an impact on the whole is quiet different. Teachers just do not see it the same way. They are mostly concerned with what they see as affecting their job performance directly. Thus, the tension between teacher and principal increases as these scenarios unfold on a daily basis.

The structure of teacher work is yet another obstacle to be overcome. Work demands control the kind and importance of tasks performed. Emphasis is placed on meeting basic work requirements in exchange for extrinsic benefits.

Mandated curriculum and teaching models that are highly structured and prescriptive contribute to the bureaucracy of teacher work. Isolation, privatism and lack of social interaction is encouraged by these practices. The work place is typically designed so that no else in the school knows what they are doing or how well they are doing it. Teachers for too long have been isolated from those surrounding them. They are expected to enter into an enclosed room and put into place an explicit instructional delivery system. They are accustomed to this behavioral expectation. Therefore, when opportunities arise to explore and discuss teaching and learning, it is no wonder they are only concerned about their own practices.

The bureaucratic work structure also lends itself to rewards and punishments being traded for compliance. If a teacher performs the way he/she is supposed to, as defined by whomever, a good evaluation is forth coming. A good evaluation may mean a

promotion. The same rule applies within the constraints of the classroom with students. Principals give to teachers and teachers give to students. It is a never ending cycle. Everyone becomes connected to the school for calculative reasons and not true commitment.

Finally, district-school relationships often bring havoc to what could be effective implementation of reform. Again the bureaucratic hierarchy taints the cultural norms. Who has control and how much control? The relationship between the district and the school is similar to that of the principal and teacher. The "authority" at the district level may intrude upon life at the local school. Local organizational structures are influenced by beliefs of those at the district level.

Often times the principal is viewed from the nucleus of the system as enforcer of rules and regulations, much the same as the relationship between principal and teacher. It is only at a higher rung on the ladder. The principal is expected to execute directives given from above even if he/she does not agree with the directive.

If site based management involving funding is not practiced, financial issues become prominent as an obstacle stemming from district-school relationships. Reform efforts embracing collaboration and collegiality require additional funding. For example, the principal plans release time for teachers to observe peers for future discussion on effective teaching. Will certified substitute teachers be provided and funding made available?

Another example may be a decision made by a group of teachers to implement a new educational program which additional monies are needed. Will it be funded? The principal's expertise and trust in his/her staff is challenged through decisions made from those removed from the local setting. Autonomy at the local level becomes crucial.

There is no package to deliver that will guarantee successful implementation of collaborative efforts. I tend to agree with Sergiovanni that changing the metaphor is a beginning. When moving towards "community", we must be careful not to view constructs with an "organizational" mindframe. For example, collegiality comes from within and not a result of an organizational arrangement. Empowerment within a community is more than participating in shared decision making. It is characteristic of true commitment to obligations and duties that members feel toward each other and the school.

Strategies to encourage collaboration and collegiality must include more that adoption and implementation. Techniques may be inclusive of common preparation time, release time for peer observation, group decision making, options for staff development, action research and opportunities to develop quality programs. However, care must be given to top-down strategies that enforce controlled forms of collaboration and collegiality. Techniques cannot be mandated to be successful. They must become part of the normative culture of the school which is only possible through a carefully planned process of change which involves all members of

the community.

After all is said and done, weakening the strongholds takes more than talking the talk. The administrator must walk the talk as well.

REFERENCES

Bryk, A.S. & Driscoll, M.E. (1988). The high school as community: Contextual influences and consequences for students and teachers. Madison, Wisconsin: National Center for Effective Secondary Schools at the University of Wisconsin.

Bryk, A.S., Lee, V., & Holland, P. (1983). Catholic schools and the common good. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Coleman, J., & Hoffer, T. (1987). Public and private schools: The impact of communities. New York: Basic Books.

Crow, G.M. (1984). Community and diversity: Administration in a democratic context. NASSP Bulletin, 40-45.

Ellett, C.D., Loup, K.S., & Chauvin, S.W. (1990) System for Teaching and learning Assessment and Review. (STAR). Statewide Teaching Internship and Teacher Evaluation Programs. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana Department of Education, College of Education, Louisiana State University.

Hall, G.E. & Hord, S.M. (1987). Change in schools: Facilitating the process. New York: State University of New York Press.

Joyce, B., Wolf, J., & Calhoun E. (1993). The self-renewing school. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Kirby, P.C. & Blase, J.J. (1991). Teachers' perceptions of principals affect collaborative efforts. NASSP Bulletin, 75, 111-115.

Licata, J. & Ellett, C. (1990). LEAD program provides support, development for new principals. NASSP Bulletin, 74, 5-10.

Little, J. (1992). Opening the black box of professional community. In A. Lieberman (Eds.), The changing contexts of teaching, (pp 157-170). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Noddings, N. (1988). An ethic of caring and its implications for instructional arrangement. American Journal of Education, 96, 215-230.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SAMPLE QUESTIONS ON SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

1. What are your perceptions of education now?
2. How do you presently view the school as a whole?
3. What do you consider the greatest assets? greatest needs?
4. What are your beliefs about the new administrator?
5. What do you expect from the new administrator?
6. What concerns do you have?
7. What changes do you think will be made?
8. What needs to remain unchanged in this school?

APPENDIX B

LEADERSHIP IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION DEVELOPMENT
(LEAD)

I. Brainstorm - "What are the problems in your school?"

LIST

II. Develop a Problem Defintion - Why don't progams work? (Management by Crisis) -- Solve indicators, not the problem

GROUP/COLLAPSE (P & P) - Common Themes?

INDICATOR/PROBLEM/SOLUTION? - Critically analyze the indicators.

DEVELOP PROBLEM DEFINITION BASED ON INDICATORS - "How can we. . ." -- Question stated positively.

CHECK VALIDITY - Goodness of "fit"

III. Chart Alternatives - Finding the "best" solution/Considering all the options

BRAINSTORM - Generate alternatives (P & P)

INTENDED CONSEQUENCES - What do we want to accomplish with each?

NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES - Scanning the organization - SUPPRPEPS

RANK ALTERNATIVES - Compare for selection/Plan B in line

IV. Plan for Solution - Develop a Management Plan

MANAGEMENT PLAN -

Review intended consequences and anticipated negative consequences

List activities that will accomplish intended consequences and eliminate/reduce NC's

Identify: 1)Persons responsible, 2) starting and ending dates, 3) completions criteria **for each activity**

V. Implement Objective - "Just do it!"

UNANTICIPATED NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES - Adaptation/Flexibility

EVALUATION - 1) Accomplish IC's? 2) Extent of NC's Reduced or Eliminated

LEAD - BRAINSTORMING ACTIVITY

Problems brainstormed:

1. mice
2. lunchroom noise
3. lunchroom behavior
4. running on the sidewalk
5. children bringing toys to school
6. no soap in student restrooms
7. no towels in student restrooms
8. no tissue in student restrooms
9. no stall doors in restrooms
10. Student restroom locked too soon in the afternoon. Teachers' children have no place to go.
11. Teachers'/staff children
12. noisy parents outside doors at 2:00
13. lawn mower noise at 2:00
14. parents coming straight to rooms
15. a too bossy parent in the workroom
16. gates are being left unlocked
17. drop off spot too crowded
18. parents lost at school
19. students arriving too early
20. too many middle school students on campus

The following were added by the 6 member committee:

21. Kindergarten misbehavior at recess
22. Parents dropping off students at the bus stop
23. too much paperwork
24. too much duplication in paperwork
25. teachers not knowing when bus loads change
26. teachers not being informed of lunch schedule changes
27. teachers not knowing the lunch menu for the day/week
28. lack of communication from the office to teachers

The committee formed the following groupings from the problems brainstormed:

JANITORIAL
mice
no soap in student restrooms
no towels in student restrooms
no tissue in student restrooms
no stall doors in student restrooms
lawn mower noise at 2:00
gates are being left unlocked

DISCIPLINE
lunchroom noise
lunchroom behavior
running on the sidewalk
children bringing toys to school
kindergarten misbehavior at recess
students destroying/defacing school bathrooms/sidewalks

PARENTS
noisy parents outside doors at 2:00
parents coming straight to the rooms
a too bossy parent in the workroom
drop off spot too crowded
parents lost at school
students arriving too early
parents dropping students off at the bus stop

TEACHERS'/STAFF CHILDREN
student restroom being locked too soon in the afternoon
teachers'/staff children

MISCELLANEOUS
too many middle school students on campus
too much paperwork
too much duplication of paperwork
teachers not knowing when bus loads change
teachers not being informed of lunch schedule changes
teachers not knowing the lunch menu for the day/week
lack of communication from the office to teachers

LEAD - MEETING #3

A **problem definition** is positively stated in question form. This stimulates consideration of alternative solutions. The problem definition should begin with "how can we..."

EXAMPLE:
List of problem indicators
1. Poor student attendance
2. Students sleeping in class
3. Little student involvement in extracurricular activities
4. School newspaper closes down for lack of interest

Problem definition
How can we decrease student apathy?

Problem statements for:

1. Janitorial indicators
   How can we communicate janitorial needs to custodial staff?

2. Discipline indicators
   How can we improve student behavior outside the classrooms?

3. Parents indicators
   How can we enforce school policy regarding parents on campus?

4. Teachers'/staff children
   How can we accommodate the needs of teachers/staff children after school?

What problem definition will we choose to seek alternative solutions?

How can we improve student behavior outside the classrooms?

(e.g. cafeteria, playground, bus stop, etc.)

CHARTING ALTERNATIVES

ALTERNATIVE	INTENDED CONSEQUENCE	NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCE
CAFETERIA		
1. Establish rules across grade levels and consequences	more orderly, positive atmosphere	more discipline referrals; inflexibility
2. Audiometer (light)	self monitoring of student behavior	some enjoy seeing the red light
3. Lunch monitors	free time for teachers	cost or solicitation of volunteers
4. Assigned seating		
5. Change lunch menus		parish guidelines must be adhered to
PLAYGROUND		
1. Establish rules and enforce consistency	safer environment	less flexibility in dealing with special needs
2. Purchase play equipment	more structure, encourages positive interaction, and enhances physical ed. skills	money, increase in injuries, need for new rules
3. Designate play areas for equipment		little campus space
4. Change recess schedule		
BUS STOP		
1. Establish rules to be consistently maintained	more orderly and safer school closure	less flexibility and possibility of teachers not being consistent
2. Open cafeteria earlier	prevent long line	unsupervised students may wander into the cafeteria
3. All teachers accompany students all the way to buses	orderly exits	walk further; cut into instructional time
4. Group students by grade level and perhaps assign seats in the cafeteria	know which student creates problem at any given seat	increase in paperwork

CONSEQUENCE ANALYSIS MANAGEMENT PLAN

Objective: Student behavior will improve outside the classroom.

Outcomes: Less disruptive behavior and a safer environment as evidenced by the number and type of discipline referrals.

	ACTIVITY	PERFORMED BY	DATE BEGUN	COMPLETION DATE	CRITERIA
1.	Establish rules and enforce consistency for each category (recess, lunch, bus stop)	Committee	January	May	List of rules posted in cafeteria and classrooms
2.	Parental notification	Teacher, Parent, Student	March	August '93	Returned forms on file
3.	Revise Teacher and Student Handbooks (additions)	Committee	April	August '93	Copy of handbooks

APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL'S FORM

TEACHER ATTITUDE INVENTORY

DIRECTIONS FOR PRINCIPALS: As part of the LEAD project, your teachers have been asked to complete the Teacher Attitude Inventory. LEAD principals are also being asked to complete this instrument . . . . except from a different perspective. First, read each statement carefully and then decide what you think the most typical response will be from teachers in your school. Use the scale provided and mark one letter on your answer sheet for each item that best expresses your opinion. Try to avoid letting your response to one item influence your response to the next item. Remember, your responses indicate what you think the most typical response will be from teachers in your school.

***** PLACE YOUR ANSWERS ON THE COMPUTER SHEET PROVIDED *****

1. In this school I fill the role of (choose one only):
   - A. Principal
   - B. Assistant Principal
   - C. Teacher
   - D. Ancillary

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral or No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
2. My principal backs me up in my dealings with parents.	A	B	C	D	E
3. My principal seldom tries to get my ideas about things.	A	B	C	D	E
4. My principal keeps me well informed about matters affecting my work.	A	B	C	D	E
5. I seldom get the help I need in handling difficult discipline cases.	A	B	C	D	E
6. My principal fails to "go to bat" for us with his/her superiors.	A	B	C	D	E
7. My principal seldom shows initiative in seeking ways to help us in our work.	A	B	C	D	E
8. My principal is fair in his/her dealings with me.	A	B	C	D	E
9. My principal seems to take suggestions for improvement as a personal criticism.	A	B	C	D	E
10. My principal has an unrealistic view of what goes on in my work situation.	A	B	C	D	E
11. The instructional materials provided for me in my work are very satisfactory.	A	B	C	D	E
12. Students in this school sometimes have to do without needed supplementary materials.	A	B	C	D	E
13. The school library and/or reference materials available to students are adequate to meet instructional needs.	A	B	C	D	E
14. It is easy and convenient in this school to get teaching aids and equipment to use in the classroom.	A	B	C	D	E
15. I have sufficient supplies for my work.	A	B	C	D	E
16. Too many teachers in this school seem to be more concerned with their own personal interests rather than with the overall welfare of the school.	A	B	C	D	E

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ADJECTIVE PAIRS CHECKLIST

DIRECTIONS FOR PRINCIPALS: As part of Louisiana LEAD assessment activities this year, your teachers have been asked to complete the adjective pairs checklist for each of the concepts below. Principals are also being asked to complete this instrument . . . . except from a different perspective.

Ten adjective pairs are provided below to describe two key concepts/elements of the school work environment. For each adjective pair, mark one letter on your answer sheet to indicate what you think the most typical response from teachers will be in your school. Try to avoid letting your response to one adjective pair or concept influence your response to the next adjective pair/concept. Remember, your responses indicate what you think the most typical response from teachers will be in your school. Mark only one letter for each adjective pair and complete all adjective pairs for each concept.

PLACE YOUR ANSWERS ON THE COMPUTER SHEET PROVIDED

"MY PRINCIPAL IS"

64.	boring	A	B	C	D	E	interesting
65.	fresh	A	B	C	D	E	stale
66.	meaningless	A	B	C	D	E	meaningful
67.	important	A	B	C	D	E	unimportant
68.	usual	A	B	C	D	E	unusual
69.	powerful	A	B	C	D	E	weak
70.	passive	A	B	C	D	E	active
71.	thrilling	A	B	C	D	E	quieting
72.	uneventful	A	B	C	D	E	action-packed
73.	challenging	A	B	C	D	E	dull

"MY SCHOOL IS"

74.	boring	A	B	C	D	E	interesting
75.	fresh	A	B	C	D	E	stale
76.	meaningless	A	B	C	D	E	meaningful
77.	important	A	B	C	D	E	unimportant
78.	usual	A	B	C	D	E	unusual
79.	powerful	A	B	C	D	E	weak
80.	passive	A	B	C	D	E	active
81.	thrilling	A	B	C	D	E	quieting
82.	uneventful	A	B	C	D	E	action-packed
83.	challenging	A	B	C	D	E	dull

DIRECTIONS: Found below are questions about your attitude towards novice principals, that is principals who are in their first year of service. Darken the appropriate space or your computer answer sheet which best represents your feelings after thinking about the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item. Please consider each item independently of all others.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral or No Opinion	Agree	Strongly Agree
84. Checking up on first-year principals to make sure they do their work is necessary.	A	B	C	D	E
85. Ignoring first-year principals' administrative mistakes is unsafe.	A	B	C	D	E
86. First-year principals have the most knowledge about how best to manage their teachers.	A	B	C	D	E
87. Inconsistencies in first-year principals' management goals should not be ignored.	A	B	C	D	E
88. First-year principals should be closely monitored to make sure that they are performing their management tasks well.	A	B	C	D	E
89. The professionalism of first-year principals is overrated.	A	B	C	D	E
90. Wherever a first-year principal's management mistakes are observed, they should be drawn to the principal's attention.	A	B	C	D	E
91. First-year principals should be free to reject advice from others about their management methods.	A	B	C	D	E
92. First-year principals do their work competently because they have professional training.	A	B	C	D	E
93. Supervisor observations of first-year principals in their schools should be minimized.	A	B	C	D	E
94. Complaints about a first-year principal's discipline methods should be thoroughly investigated.	A	B	C	D	E
95. First-year principals can be trusted to work out school problems in their own way.	A	B	C	D	E
96. A first-year principal's errors in handling specific school management tasks should be overlooked.	A	B	C	D	E
97. My trust in first-year principals' work competence results from my belief in principal professionalism.	A	B	C	D	E
98. First-year principals adhere to a professional code of conduct in their schools.	A	B	C	D	E
99. Degrees and certifications are given when aspiring first-year principals have successfully met professional standards.	A	B	C	D	E
100. First-year principals' management mistakes should be overlooked because they will correct their own problems in time.	A	B	C	D	E